

REMARKS

Claims 1-58 were pending and stand rejected. Claims 13-15, 33-35, and 53-55 have been cancelled. Claims 1-6, 8, 10-12, 16, 21-26, 28, 30-32, 36, 41-46, 48, 50-52, and 56 have been amended. Claims 1-12, 16-32, 36-52, and 56-58 are pending upon entry of this amendment.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully traverse. Claim 1 has been amended to recite "computer-implemented method" instead of "method."

Claims 1, 3-8, 13-16, 18, 21, 23-28, 33-36, 38, 41, 43-48, 53-56, and 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gaines in view of Blumenau. Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Examiner and the undersigned attorney had a telephone conversation on July 28, 2005, during which they discussed claim 1. The Examiner stated that if the first limitation in the body of claim 1 ("designating a virtual super-user, the virtual super-user being associated with a virtual process, wherein the virtual process is a plurality of actual processes") were replaced by "associating a user with a virtual private server, the virtual private server comprising a plurality of actual processes" and "designating the user as a virtual super-user", the claim would be patentable over Gaines in view of Blumenau. While Applicants do not agree that the references disclose or suggest the previously recited elements (in particular the cited references do not disclose virtual processes), in the interests of advancing prosecution, Applicants have amended claims 1, 21, and 41 in the manner suggested by the Examiner to more clearly recite the virtual private servers and the designation of a user as a virtual super-user. Additional claims have been amended to make use of the same terminology as claims 1, 21, and 41.

Claims 2, 22, and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gaines in view of Blumenau and futher in view of Hutchison. Claims 9-12, 17, 19-20, 29-32, 37, 39-40, 49-52, and 57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gaines in view of Blumenau and futher in view of O'Brien. Applicants respectfully traverse. These claims depend from their respective base claims, which the Examiner agreed were patentable (as amended) over Gaines in view of Blumenau. In addition, these claims recite other features not included in their respective base claims. Thus, claims 2, 22, and 42 are patentable over Gaines in view of Blumenau and futher in view of Hutchison, and claims 9-12, 17, 19-20, 29-32, 37, 39-40, 49-52, and 57 are patentable over Gaines in view of Blumenau and futher in view of O'Brien. Additionally, for the record, Applicants traverse the Examiner's assertions concerning the disclosure of Hutchison and the motivation to combine Gaines and Blumenau and Hutchison, and concerning the disclosure of O'Brien and the motivation to combine Gaines and Blumenau and O'Brien.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are allowable over the cited art of record and request that the Examiner allow this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in order to advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

XUN WILSON HUANG, et al.

Dated: 8-4-05

By: Sabra-Anne R. Truesdale

Sabra-Anne R. Truesdale  
Reg. No. 55,687  
Fenwick & West LLP  
Silicon Valley Center  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Tel.: (650) 335-7187  
Fax.: (650) 938-5200